



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/769,380  | 01/26/2001  | Shinichi Nojima      | 1614.1119           | 5766             |
| 21171   | 7590        | 10/18/2005           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP<br>SUITE 700<br>1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20005 |             |                      | SAIN, GAUTAM        |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 2176                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/769,380

Applicant(s)

NOJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

- 1) This is a NonFinal rejection in response to the Remarks filed via RCE on 7/5/05.
- 2) Claims 1-24 are pending and rejected.
- 3) The Examiner introduces a new line of rejection under 35 USC 112.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

- 4) A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/5/05 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

- 5) The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 5-1) Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Using claim 1 as the example to show the indefinite language, the claim limitations "a detecting section detecting a keyword from a character string that is being input by the character input function" can reasonably be interpreted in more than one manner. The first interpretation can be "as a detecting section detecting a keyword, *where the keyword is being input by the character input function*, from a character

string." Alternatively, the second interpretations can be as "a detecting section detecting a keyword from a character string, *where the character is being input* by the character input function." It is difficult to understand which concept the phrase "that is being input" is qualifying. Please clarify the claim limitations to distinctly claim the invention.

For purposes of examination of the application, the Examiner is using the first interpretation, that detection of a keyword that is being input by the character input function.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**6-1) Claims 1,2,4,8,11,14,15,16, 17,18, 19, 20,21, 22, 23,24 rejected under 35**

**U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Ceantar**

**(<http://www.ceantar.org/dicts/search.html>. (Published April 1998), in view of**

**Hatakeyama et al (US 5469354, issued Nov 1995).**

**Regarding claims 1,4,8,11,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24, Ceantar teaches**  
*detecting section detecting a keyword which is specified by one or more input*  
*characters (ie., 'search for' field) and*

*a display section displaying dictionaries when the keyword indicating registered dictionaries when the keyword is detected by said detecting section (ie., section under 'select the dictionary (or dictionaries) to search') and*

*an issuing section issuing a search request.... Dictionary search program (ie., button 'Start Search');*

Ceantar does not teach, but Hatakeyama teaches

*From a character string that is being input by the character input function (ie., search for a given search term in a character string for inclusion of the term in the string)(col 3, lines 50-65)(ie., inputted search term)(col 3, lines 24-30);*

*Keyword detecting (ie., search facility that checks for inclusion of word)(col 3, lines 50-65).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include searching for a search term in a character string as taught by Hatakeyama, providing the benefit of speeding up the full text search of a large scale text database (col 3, lines 40-46) with Japanese text (col 4, line 37; col 7, lines 14-21).

**Regarding claim 2**, Ceantar teaches "issuing section ... define the input characters" (ie., user can check in the check box next to the plurality of dictionaries to search for the word indicted in the 'search for' window).

Ceantar does not expressly teach, but Hatakeyama teaches

*Of the character string (ie., character strings ...)(col 3, lines 60-65).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include character string as taught by Hatakeyama, providing the benefit of speeding up the full text search of a large scale text database (col 3, lines 40-46) with Japanese text (col 4, line 37; col 7, lines 14-21).

**6-2) Claims 5,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar (as cited above), in view of Brown et al (US 6665838 B1, filed Jul 30, 1999).**

**Regarding claim 5,9**, Ceantar does not expressly teach, but Brown teaches “a registering section... interactive process” (ie., server sends the page and the set of thumbnails to the client ... responsive to finding the user criteria on a linked page within the set of linked pages, the server modifies the page to indicate the presence of the user criteria on the linked page and sends a modified page to the client)(col 2, lines 23-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include a server retrieving the page and generating a set of thumbnails in the database and sending the page and the set of thumbnails to the client as taught by Brown, providing the benefit a search engine for internet users to enable them to make more informed decisions about which link to follow and present a method for presenting content from the page in a distributed database upon receiving a request from a client for a page (col 2, lines 15-21; lines 24-26).

**6-3) Claims 6, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar (as cited above), in view of Brandt et al (US 6377993 B1, filed Sep 24, 1998).**

Regarding claims 6, 12, Ceantar does not expressly teach, but Brandt teaches *displays a program (including conversion program) ... cannot be started(including cannot convert)(ie., metadata format ...if errors are found in the input, the RM returns an error message to the requesting client; fail due to insufficient or missing data .. result in error messages being sent to the report manager or local log when request message cannot be parsed due to bad data or invalid format.. invalid request format or parameter... )(col 15, lines 1-12; col 25, lines 51-62).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to check for format errors in the input and return an error message to the client for bad or invalid format as taught by Brandt, providing the benefit of an internet/intranet/web-based data management tool that provides a common GUI enabling the requesting of various types of data, enables customers to access relevant data information timely, rapidly and accurately through the GUI client interface, enable secure initiation of data reports (Brands, abstract section).

**6-4) Claims 3,7,10,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar (as cited above), in view of Tran et al (US 6157935, Filed Dec 17, 1996), further in view of Hatakeyama (as cited above).**

**Regarding claim 3, 7, 10, 13**, Ceantar does not expressly teach, but Tran teaches an *ending section ... input characters* (ie., stop button cancels the loading of a page)(col 21, lines 29-30);

Ceantar in view of Tran does not expressly teach, but Hatakeyama teaches *Of the character string* (ie., fragmental character strings resulting from the decomposition ... character strings)(col 3, lines 64-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include a stop button to cancel the loading of a page as taught by Tran, providing the benefit of significant productivity gains in modeling complex data (Tran, col 1, lines 60-65) for remote data access and management systems (title) and enhance the efficiency of field personnel (col 2, lines 45-50) using a graphical user interface with icons and menus across the top for retrieval purposes, which guide the user through cyberspace in a linear manner, where the user is not hampered by delays on-line (col 21, lines 23-49), further to include character strings as taught by Hatakeyama, providing the benefit of speeding up the full text search of a large scale text database (col 3, lines 40-46) with Japanese text (col 4, line 37; col 7, lines 14-21).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/5/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The main argument of the Applicant is that Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama does not teach "detection section detecting a keyword from a character string that is being input by the character input function". The Examiner disagrees (in accordance to



Art Unit: 2176

the interpretation by the Examiner as stated in the 35 USC 112 rejection above), when applying both art as a whole does teach this element and limitations. In fact, Ceantar itself suggests (although may not expressly teach) most of this limitation since Ceantar does teach searching for a character string anywhere in the text of a dictionary (see Ceantar) and Hatakeyama does teach searching that checks for inclusion of words (see col 3, lines 50-65).

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GS

GS

*William L. Bashore*  
WILLIAM BASHORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
10/15/2005